

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated December 21, 2009. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further examination are requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C §103(a):

Claims 16 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atake (JP 11/099536) in view of Yoshida (JP 2000-117786). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 16 recites, in part, setting a decorating film between a first mold element and a second mold element placed in opposition to each other so that a molding space is defined by the decorating film and the first mold element, the molding space comprising a resin-discharging-use molding space, which is formed adjacent to at least part of a product molding space, into which the molding resin from the product molding space flows, and discharging part of the molding resin from the product molding space into the resin-discharging-use molding space as the molding resin continues to flow radially outward from the gate portion.

Thus, the above features as recited in claim 16 allow the resin to flow radially outward into the resin-discharging-use-molding space during the normal molding operation, to prevent resins burns caused from the resin colliding with itself in the product molding space. If resin burns do occur, they will be in the resin-discharging-use molding space and can be easily discarded without affecting the molded product. The above features, as recited in claim 16, are not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Atake and Yoshida.

As noted in the amendment filed on June 18, 2009, Atake discloses an injection-molding method with simultaneous decorating. However, according to the disclosure of Atake, the slots 41-46 (which the Examiner identifies as corresponding to the resin-discharging-use molding space of claim 1) are located between the cavity 13 and the suction slot 16 in order to prevent any resin from getting in the vacuum holes 17 of the suction slot 16 in the event of a fracture in the china-painting sheet S near location X. (See paragraph 61.) As shown in Figure 3, the space in the slot 43 is completely sealed from the molding space 3 during the molding operation. As a result, the molding resin does not flow from the molding cavity 13 into the slots 41-46, because the china-painting sheet S seals the slots 41-46 from the cavity 13. Therefore, Atake does not

disclose or suggest setting a decorating film between a first mold element and a second mold element placed in opposition to each other so that a molding space is defined by the decorating film and the first mold element, the molding space comprising a resin-discharging-use molding space, which is formed adjacent to at least part of a product molding space, into which the molding resin from the product molding space flows, and discharging part of the molding resin from the product molding space into the resin-discharging-use molding space as the molding resin continues to flow radially outward from the gate portion, as recited in claim 16. Yoshida also fails to disclose or suggest the above features as recited in claim 16.

Yoshida is explicitly relied upon in the rejection as disclosing a resin-injection-use molding space, which is formed adjacent to at least part of the product molding space, with a gate portion through which molding resin is injected from outside of the molding space, and injecting the molding resin through the gate portion into the resin-injection-use molding space, thereby filling the resin-injection use molding space with the molding resin as it flows radially outward from the gate portion and into the product molding space (see Office Action, page 4). Therefore, the Examiner is relying entirely on Atake for the disclosure of the resin-discharging-use molding space which, as noted above, fails to disclose such a feature.

Accordingly, no obvious combination of Atake and Yoshida would result in, or otherwise render obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the features recited in claim 16. As a result, claim 16 is patentable over the combination of Atake and Yoshida.

Claim 20 is dependent on independent claim 16 discussed above. As a result, claims 16 and 20 are allowable over the combination of Atake and Yoshida.

Claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atake (JP 11/099536) in view of Yoshida (JP 2000-117786) and further in view of Gumery (FR 2729886). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 21 is ultimately dependent on claim 16, discussed in detail above.

Gumery is relied upon in the rejection as disclosing that paint is injected into a mold before the part has completely solidified. However, it is apparent Gumery fails to disclose or suggest the feature lacking from the combination of Atake and Yoshida discussed above with regard to independent claim 16. Accordingly, no obvious combination of Atake, Yoshida, and Gumery would result in, or otherwise render obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the features

recited in claims 16 or 21. Therefore, claim 21 is patentable over the combination of Atake, Yoshida, and Gumery.

Claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atake (JP 11/099536) in view of Yoshida (JP 2000-117786) and further in view of Hashimoto (JP H04-71216 U). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 22 is dependent on claim 16, discussed in detail above.

Hashimoto is relied upon in the rejection as disclosing compressing the molding resin 16 in the molding space by reducing the capacity of the molding space. However, it is apparent Hashimoto fails to disclose or suggest the feature lacking from the combination of Atake and Yoshida discussed above with regard to independent claim 16. Accordingly, no obvious combination of Atake, Yoshida, and Hashimoto would result in, or otherwise render obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the features recited in claims 16 or 22. Therefore, claim 22 is patentable over the combination of Atake, Yoshida, and Hashimoto.

Withdrawn claims 23 and 26-29 recite the same features as those of allowable claim 16. Therefore, it is submitted that withdrawn claims 23 and 26-29 are also allowable over the references. As a result, it is respectfully requested that withdrawn claims 23 and 26-29 receive due consideration and are also allowed.

Because of the above-mentioned distinctions, it is believed clear that claims 16, 20-23, and 26-29 are allowable over the references relied upon in the rejections. Furthermore, it is submitted that the distinctions are such that a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would not have been motivated to make any combination of the references of record in such a manner as to result in, or otherwise render obvious, the present invention as recited in claims 16, 20-23, and 26-29. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 16, 20-23, and 26-29 are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. The examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that there are issues remaining which must be resolved before allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Eiji FURUKAWA et al.

/Allen N. Doyel/

By 2010.03.22 13:20:11 -04'00'

Allen N. Doyel

Registration No. 60,391

Agent for Applicants

AND/JRF/ats

Washington, D.C. 20005-1503

Telephone (202) 721-8200

Facsimile (202) 721-8250

March 22, 2010